

Agenda Memorandum Historic Preservation Commission

# DATE:

# **SUBJECT:**

<u>Certificate of Appropriateness Request:</u> <u>Applicant:</u> <u>Location of Subject Property:</u> <u>PIN:</u> <u>Staff Report Prepared by:</u> July 13, 2022

H-17-22 Sandra West 410 Union St S 5630-24-0324 Brad Lagano, Senior Planner

# BACKGROUND

- The subject property at 401 Union St S is designated as a "Pivotal" structure in the South Union Street Historic District (ca. 1921-1927) (Exhibit A).
- "Handsome, two-story brick house combining Neo-Federal and Mission Revival elements and enjoying deep setting in pleasantly landscaped grounds. House designed by Charlotte architect M. R. Marsh. The tiled roof and creamy tan brick give the design its Mission flavor; most of the details are Neo-Federal in character. The finest feature in the latter style is the entrance, composed of a gable-roofed portico upheld by thin Doric columns, and a fan lit doorway. Four round-headed windows with awnings flank the entrance. There is an open porch upheld by Doric columns on the house's south (right) side. The interior displays restrained Neo-Federal details" (Exhibit A).
- "This house occupies the southern side of the Ritchie family tract purchased by Charles F. Ritchie during the early 1900s. George Patterson Ritchie, one of Charles Ritchie's sons, obtained this parcel from his father in a trade. George Patterson Ritchie founded Ritchie Auto Parts as a branch of the family business, the Ritchie Hardware Company" (Exhibit A).
- Applicant's requested modifications:
  - "ex post facto" (after-the-fact) approval for removal of multiple trees;
  - install new patio; and
  - replace two roll up garage doors.

# **DISCUSSION**

On May 23, 2022, Sandra West applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness under Concord Development Ordinance (CDO) §9.8 for "ex post facto" (after the fact) approval to remove seven trees and replace with seven similar tree species in the same general vicinity, install an approximately 800 square foot flat paver patio in the rear yard adjacent to the existing driveway and garage, and replace two existing roll up garage doors with two new roll up garage doors (Exhibit B).

# "Ex Post Facto" Tree Removal

The applicant purchased the subject property in April 2022 and began spring cleaning the grounds from overgrowth. Being new to the Historic District, the applicant was not familiar with the approval process and requirements concerning removal of trees with a Diameter Breast Height (DBH) over six inches as well as for pruning limbs over six inches.

Bill Leake, City Arborist, performed a site inspection on May 12, 2022, and determined the following trees should have received HPC approval prior to being removed based on stump width and debris health:

- Trees #1 & 2 Southern Magnolias Risk Rating 2 Bill's comment: "The debris from these two removed trees showed no signs or symptoms of above normal risk" (Exhibit D).
- Tree #3 Shortleaf Pine Risk Rating 4

Bill's comment: "The debris from this removed tree showed no signs or symptoms of above normal risk" (Exhibit E).

- Tree #4 Shortleaf Pine Risk Rating 3 Bill's comment: "The debris from this removed tree showed no signs or symptoms of above normal risk" (Exhibit F).
- Tree #5 Pecan Risk Rating 2 Bill's comment: "The debris from this removed tree showed no signs or symptoms of above normal risk" (Exhibit G).
- Tree #6 Pecan Risk Rating 4 Bill's comment: "The debris from this removed tree showed no signs or symptoms of above normal risk" (Exhibit H).
- Tree #7 Dogwood Risk Rating 3 Bill's comment: "The debris from this removed tree did show some dead branches, but the trunk still retained sap" (Exhibit I).

# Flat Paver Patio

The applicant proposes to install a new flat paver patio approximately 800 square feet in size. There will be no wall around the perimeter of the patio and will be flush with the ground surface. The patio will be located in the rear year adjacent to the garage and provide a hard surface connecting the existing circular driveway and trellis to the garage structure. The proposed material will be Techo Blue Shale Grey Blu 60 HD Smooth Slab natural material set in a three-piece pattern. It will be installed on Aggregate Base Coarse (ABC), which is where gravel is used as a hard pack sub-base compaction material for a variety of applications such as base material for pavers, segmental retaining walls, or concrete slabs. It is made up of a mix of crushed stone, topsoil and dust (Exhibits J, K, L).

### **Roll Up Garage Doors**

The applicant proposes to replace the two existing roll up garage doors with two new roll up garage doors. The existing larger roll up garage door is approximately 7' tall x 18'-7" wide while the smaller roll up garage door is approximately 7' tall x 5'-2' wide. Each existing door is comprised of three rows of short, rectangular, solid panels and one row of short, rectangular, glass panels with the latter being the second row from the top. Both doors are cream in color. The new roll up garage doors will be similar in design, color, and character using the Amarr Lincoln roll up garage door model (Exhibits M, N).

# **ATTACHMENTS**

Exhibit A: National Register of Historic Places Inventory Exhibit B: Certificate of Appropriateness Application Exhibit C: Subject Property Map Exhibit D: Trees #1 & 2 – Tree Risk Assessment Form & Photos Exhibit E: Tree #3 – Tree Risk Assessment Form & Photos Exhibit F: Tree #4 – Tree Risk Assessment Form & Photos Exhibit G: Tree #5 – Tree Risk Assessment Form & Photos Exhibit H: Tree #6 – Tree Risk Assessment Form & Photos Exhibit I: Tree #7 – Tree Risk Assessment Form & Photos Exhibit J: Flat Paver Patio Proposed Location on Survey Exhibit K: Photos of Flat Paver Patio Proposed Location Existing Conditions Exhibit L: Flat Paver Patio Project Description Exhibit M: Photos of Existing Roll Up Garage Doors Exhibit N: New Roll Up Garage Doors Specification Sheet

# HISTORIC HANDBOOK DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

# Approval Requirement Needs Table: Trees

- *Removal of healthy trees or pruning of limbs over six inches in diameter in any location on the property requires Commission hearing and approval.*
- *Tree topping removal of one-third of green surface of canopy, or leaving stubs larger than three inches in diameter requires Commission hearing and approval.*

# Chapter 5 – Section 8: Landscaping and Trees

- One of the most visible features of the Districts is the landscaping and the associated tree canopy. Activities which negatively impact any aspect of the landscape should be avoided, such as the removal of healthy trees and mature shrubs.
- Tree health may be decided upon by the acquisition of a Tree Hazard Evaluation Form issued by the City Arborist or a report submitted by a certified arborist. Healthy trees are trees that have a hazard rating of four or lower. Removal of healthy trees over the size of six inches in diameter (measured four feet above ground) or pruning of healthy tree limbs over six inches in diameter requires Historic Preservation Commission review and approval.
- All trees that are removed should be replaced with a tree of similar species in an appropriate location unless no suitable location exists on the subject site. Trees removed within street view must also have the stumps removed below ground level.
- <u>Design Standards: Landscaping and Trees</u>
  - 1. Trees which are removed shall be replaced by a species which, upon maturity, is similar in scale to the removed specimen. For example, canopy trees shall be replaced with canopy trees, and understory trees with understory trees.

### Approval Requirement Needs Table: Patios, Walks, and Driveways

• All new patios, walks, and driveways require Commission hearing and approval.

### Chapter 5 – Section 10: Driveways, Walkways, and Patios

- New walkways should consist of appropriate natural material including gravel, concrete, stone, brick, or pervious pavers. Walkways should avoid prefabricated and imprinted stepping stones within front yards.
- <u>Design Standards: Driveways, Walkways, and Parking</u> 1. Excessive expanses of paving should be avoided.

### **Approval Requirement Needs Table: Doors**

• Replacement of original doors. Changes in door openings. Stained glass panels. Security grills or bars. All require Commission hearing and approval.

### **Chapter 5 - Section 5: Fenestrations**

- *New doors should be compatible with the period and style of the structure.*
- Alteration in door and window openings, especially on the principle façade, should be avoided whenever possible, except as a restorative measure to return an opening to its original size. New openings should be located in areas where they are not visible from the street or in areas where they are compatible with the original design.
- <u>Design Standards: Fenestrations</u>
  - 1. Use doors that are appropriate for the style of building while avoiding flat-surfaced doors, those with small decorative glass panels, and pre-finished window/side lite art glass units.

# **RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. The Historic Preservation Commission should consider the circumstances of this application for a Certificate of Appropriateness relative to the <u>North and South Union Street Historic Districts</u> <u>Handbook and Guidelines</u> and act accordingly.
- 2. If approved, applicant(s) should be informed of the following:
  - City staff and Commission will make periodic on-site visits to ensure the project is completed as approved.
  - Completed project will be photographed to update the historic properties survey.

H-17-22 EXHIBIT A

# United States Department of the Interior National Park Service

# National Register of Historic Places Inventory—Nomination Form

For NPS use only received date entered

Continuation sheet	Item number	Page
Inventory List - South Union Street	#7	37

Inventory List - South Union Street Historic District, Concord

> The house is said to have been built about 1900 for attorney Morrison It is not known when he acquired the land, but city indicate he was living there in 1902. By 1908 Caldwell Caldwell. directories indicate he was living there in 1902. By 1908 Caldwell seems to have left Concord and the house belonged to G. C. Love. Charles F. Ritchie (d. 1941), who in 1908 lived on Mt. Pleasant Road, had come to reside in the house by 1914. According to one of Ritchie's sons, it was he who arranged for the considerable enlargement of Ritchie was the proprietor of the Ritchie Hardware Company, the house. founded 1900 and incorporated in 1907. Ritchie and business. in associates erected the Pythian Building, a substantial three-story brick building in downtown Concord that is being considered for listing in the National Register.

92. George Patterson Ritchie House 401 S. Union St. 1921-1927 (SM) P

Please note: items 92 and 93 are both owned by the applicant.

Handsome, two-story brick house combining Neo-Federal and Mission Revival elements and enjoying deep setting in pleasantly landscaped grounds. House designed by Charlotte architect M. R. Marsh. The tiled **roof and** creamy tan brick give the design its Mission flavor; most of the details are Neo-Federal in character. The finest feature in the latter style is the entrance, composed of a gable-roofed portico upheld by thin Doric columns, and a fanlit doorway. Four roundheaded windows with awnings flank the entrance. There is an open porch upheld by Doric columns on the house's south (right) side. The interior displays restrained Neo-Federal details.

This house occupies the southern side of the Ritchie family tract purchased by Charles F. Ritchie during the early 1900s. George Patterson Ritchie, one of Charles Ritchie's sons, obtained this parcel from his father in a trade. George Patterson Ritchie founded Ritchie Auto Parts as a branch of the family business, the Ritchie Hardware Company. He still lives in the house.

93. Vacant Lot between 401 and 429 S. Union St. VL

> Open, pleasantly landscaped tract adjoining George Patterson Ritchie House (inv. #92) and owned by the Ritchie family. Contributes to the district as a reminder of the formerly semi-rural character of S. Union St.

Application for Certificate of

NORTH CAROLIN High Performance Living 

V

# AN INCOMPLETE APPLICATION WILL NOT BE PLACED ON THE AGENDA UNTIL ALL OF THE REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS AND/OR ITEMS LISTED ON PAGE 2 ARE SUBMITTED.

# **APPLICANT INFORMATION**

Name: Sandra West
Address: 401 UNION Street South
City: <u>CONCOVO</u> State: NC Zip Code: <u>28025</u> Telephone: <u>643.693.6010</u>
Email: Sewest 66 @gmail.com
OWNER INFORMATION
Name: Sandra West and Ralph "Trey" Wilson
Address: 401 Union Street South
City: <u>CONLOR</u> State: NC Zip Code: <u>28025</u> Telephone: <u>843</u> .6010
Email: Sewegt & b @gmall.com

# SUBJECT PROPERTY

Street Address: \_\_\_\_\_ P.I.N. #\_\_\_\_\_

Area (acres or square feet):\_\_\_\_\_Current Zoning:\_\_\_\_\_Land Use:\_\_\_\_\_

Sta	aff Use Only:	
Application Received by:	Date:	, 20
Fee: \$20.00 Received by:	Date:	, 20

**Planning & Neighborhood Development** 

35 Cabarrus Ave W . P. O. Box 308 . Concord, NC 28025 Phone (704) 920-5152 • Fax (704) 920-6962 •

OUCOBOD	
NORTH CAROLINA	Application
High Performance Living	Please note: the applicant has revised the request to
	use French doors to replace the existing garage
	doors. New roll up garage doors with be similar to the
General Requirements	existing roll up garage doors to maintain a similar
-	look and character.
The Unified Development Ordinance imp	ooses the following rules, regulations and requirements on requests for
Certificates of Appropriateness. The app	licant must, with reference to the attached plans, demonstrate how the
proposed use satisfies mese requirements	
() 1. Project or Type of Work to be Done:	Post facto CoA approval Premoving volting
_garage door and vepla	ace W/ French doors + roll-up@ga+ paver patio
2. Detailed specifications of the project	(type of siding, windows, doors, height/style of fence, color, etc.):
07 trees removed, will 1	oe replaced by 7 similar shade trees
in the same general vi	cinity, @ roll-up will be the same as
current small garage	door, and French doors will be same color
(exact specs attached)	3 paver patio location, materials
drawing attached	

#### **Required Attachments/Submittals**

- 1. Scaled site plan, if additions or accessory structures are proposed, on letter, legal or ledger paper. Larger sized copies will be accepted if 16 folded copies are submitted for distribution.
- 2. A photograph of the front of the house.
- 3. Photographs of site, project, or existing structures from a "before" perspective.
- 4. Drawings, sketches, renderings, elevations, or photographs necessary to present an illustration of the project from an "after" perspective.
- 5. Samples of windows, doors, brick, siding, etc., may be submitted with application.
- 6. Detailed list of materials that will be used to complete the project.

\*\*\*Applications may be submitted electronically.\*\*\*

#### Certification

(1) I hereby acknowledge and say that the information contained herein and herewith is true and that this application shall not be scheduled for official consideration until all of the required contents are submitted in proper form to the City of Concord Development Services Department. (2) I understand that City staff and/or members of the Historic Preservation Commission may make routine visits to the site to insure that work being done is the same as the work that was approved. (3) I understand that photographs of the completed project will be made to update the City's historic districts inventory database.

5 23 2022 Date

Sandra Ul. West

Signature of Owner/Agent

 Planning & Neighborhood Development

 35 Cabarrus Ave W ● P. O. Box 308 ● Concord, NC 28025

 Phone (704) 920-5152 ● Fax (704) 920-6962 ●



H-17-22

401 Union St S

PIN: 5630-24-0324





Source: City of Concord Planning Department

#### Disclaimer

These maps and products are designed for general reference only and data contained herein is subject to change. The City Of Concord, it's employees or agents make no warranty of merchantability or fitness for any purpose, expressed or implied, and assume no legal responsibility for the information contained therein. Data used is from multiple sources with various scales and accuracy. Additional research such as field surveys may be necessary to determine actual conditions.





Map/Location: Right Front Yard

Owner: public: \_\_\_\_\_ private: \_\_\_\_X unknown: \_\_\_\_\_ other: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 05/12/22 Inspector: Bill Leake

Date of last inspection:

# THEE CUARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 1 and 2 Species: Southern Magnolia (Magnolia grandiflora)
DBH: 8" # of trunks: 1 Height: 25' Spread: 12'
Form:  □ generally symmetric  □ minor asymmetry  □ major asymmetry  □ stump sprout  □ stag-headed
Crown class: 🛛 dominant 🗆 co-dominant 👘 intermediate 🗆 suppressed
Live crown ratio: 95 % Age class:  young  semi-mature  mature  over-mature/senescent
Pruning history: 🗆 crown cleaned 🗆 excessively thinned 🗆 topped 🛛 crown raised 🗆 pollarded 🗆 crown reduced 🗆 flush cuts
🗆 cabled/braced 🗆 none 🗆 multiple pruning events Approx. dates:

Special Value: 🗆 specimen 🛛 heritage/historic 🗆 wildlife 🗆 unusual 🗆 street tree 🗆 screen 🗆 shade 🗆 indigenous 🖾 protected by gov. agency

# TREE HEALTH \_\_\_\_\_

Foliage color. 🛛 normal	□ chlorotic □ necrotic Epicormics; □	Growth obstructions:
Foliage density:	⊠normal □sparse <b>Leaf size</b> : □ normal □ small	$\Box$ stakes $\Box$ wire/ties $\Box$ signs $\Box$ cables
Annual shoot growth:	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ poor $\Box$ none $~$ Twig Dieback: $\Box$	$\Box$ curb/pavement $\Box$ guards
Woundwood :	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ fair $\Box$ poor	
Vigor class:	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ fair $\Box$ poor	
Major pests/diseases:	None	

# SITE CONDITIONS \_\_\_\_\_

Site Character: 🛛 residence 🗆 commercial 🗆 industrial 🗆 park 🗆 open space 🗆 natural 🗆 woodland/forest
Landscape type: 🗆 parkway 🗆 raised bed 🗆 container 🗆 mound 🗆 lawn 🛛 shrub border 🗆 wind break
Irrigation: ⊠ none □ adequate □ inadequate □ excessive □ trunk wetted
Recent site disturbance? NO 🛛 construction 🖓 soil disturbance 🖓 grade change 🖓 herbicide treatment
% dripline paved: 0% Pavement lifted: NO
% dripline w/ fill soil: 0%
% dripline grade lowered: 0%
Soil problems:  drainage  shallow  compacted  droughty  saline  alkaline  acidic  small volume  disease center  history of fail  clay  expansive  slope  compacted  sources  s
Conflicts: 🗆 lights 🗆 signage 🗆 line-of-sight 🗆 view 🗆 overhead lines 🗆 underground utilities 🗆 traffic 🛛 adjacent veg. 🗆
Exposure to wind: 🗆 single tree 🛛 below canopy 🗆 above canopy 🗆 recently exposed 🗆 windward, canopy edge 🗆 area prone to windthrow
<b>Prevailing wind direction:</b> SW Occurrence of snow/ice storms $\Box$ never $\boxtimes$ seldom $\Box$ regularly

# TARGET

**Use Under Tree:** building parking traffic pedestrian recreation landscape hardscape small features utility lines Can target be moved? NO Can use be restricted? YES H-17-22 EXHIBIT D **Occupancy:**  $\boxtimes$  occasional use  $\square$  intermittent use  $\square$  frequent use  $\square$  constant use

# RISK RATING:

1	0	1	2	
ailure	+ Size +	Target	= Risk	
Potential	of part	Rating	Rating	
fannrou	od for rome	wal that	roplacomont tr	

If approved for removal, the replacement tree species and location shall be listed on the certificate of appropriateness.

ROOT DEFECTS:
Suspect root rot: NO Mushroom/conk/bracket present: NO ID:
Exposed roots:  Severe  moderate  low Undermined:  severe  moderate  low
Root pruned:       distance from trunk       Root area affected:       Buttress wounded: □       When:
Restricted root area:  severe  moderate  moderate  by  Potential for root failure:  severe  moderate  by  by  by  by  by  by  by  by  by  by
LEAN: 2 deg. from vertical 🛛 natural 🖓 unnatural 🖓 self-corrected 🖓 Soil heaving:
Decay in plane of lean:  Roots broken:  Soil cracking:
Compounding factors: Lean severity:   Severe  moderate  low

*Concern Areas:* Indicate presence of individual structural issues and rate their severity (**S** = severe, **M** = moderate, **L** = low)

DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms/bracket				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
RISK RATING				

Tree part most likely to fail in the next six months: Branches

Failure potential: 1 - low: 2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe	Size of part: <b>0</b> - 0" - 3" <b>1</b> - 3"-6"	<b>2</b> -6"-18"	<b>3</b> -18"-30"	<b>4</b> ->30"
Target rating: 0 - no target 1 - occasional use 2 - intermittent use 3 - frequent use 4	- constant use			

# **Maintenance Recommendations**

COMMENTS			
Notification: ⊠ owner □ manager ⊠ governing agency Date: 05/12/22			
Effect on adjacent trees: $\boxtimes$ none $\square$ evaluate			
$oxedsymbol{\boxtimes}$ When replaced, alternate tree replacement locations are available			
□ Remove tree □ When replaced, a similar sized tree species would be appropriate in same general location			
	Inspect further $\Box$ root crown $\Box$ decay $\Box$ aerial $\Box$ monitor		
<u>    1    0    1   2  </u>	$\Box$ thin $\Box$ raise canopy $\Box$ crown reduce $\Box$ restructure $\Box$ cable/brace		
Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating	$\boxtimes$ none $\square$ remove defective part $\square$ reduce end weight $\square$ crown clean		

The debris from these two removed trees showed no signs or symptoms of above normal tree risk.

Trees #1 & 2 - Southern Magnolias







Map/Location: Right Rear Yard

Owner: public: \_\_\_\_\_ private: \_\_\_\_X unknown: \_\_\_\_\_ other: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 05/12/22 Inspector: Bill Leake

Date of last inspection:

# TREE CHARACTERISTICS \_\_\_\_\_

RISK RATING:
<b>1 1 2 4</b> Failure + Size + Target = Risk Potential of part Rating Rating
If approved for removal, the replacement tree species and location shall be listed on the certificate of appropriateness.

Tree #: 3	Species: Shortlea	af Pine (Pinus ei	nchinata)
DBH: 22"	# of trunks: 1	Height: 70'	Spread: 25
Form: 🗆 ge	enerally symmetric	🛛 minor asymn	netry 🗆 maj
Crown class	s: 🛛 dominant 🗆	co-dominant	intermedia
Live crown	ratio: 95 %	Age class: 🗆 ye	oung 🗆 sen
Pruning his	tory: 🗆 crown clear	ned $\Box$ excessively	$\prime$ thinned $\Box$
	□cabled/brace	d 🗆 none 🗆 mult	iple pruning

Special Value: 🗆 specimen 🛛 heritage/historic 🗆 wildlife 🗆 unusual 🗆 street tree 🗆 screen 🗆 shade 🗆 indigenous 🖾 protected by gov. agency

# TREE HEALTH \_\_\_\_\_

Foliage color. 🛛 normal	□ chlorotic □ necrotic Epicormics; □	Growth obstructions:		
Foliage density:	⊠normal □sparse Leaf size: □ normal □ small	□ stakes □ wire/ties □ signs □ cables		
Annual shoot growth:	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ poor $\Box$ none $~$ Twig Dieback: $\Box$	$\Box$ curb/pavement $\Box$ guards		
Woundwood :	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ fair $\Box$ poor			
Vigor class:	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ fair $\Box$ poor			
Major pests/diseases:	None			

# SITE CONDITIONS \_\_\_\_\_

Site Character: 🛛 residence 🗆 commercial 🗆 industrial 🗆 park 🗆 open space 🗆 natural 🗆 woodland/forest
Landscape type: 🗆 parkway 🗆 raised bed 🗆 container 🗆 mound 🗆 lawn 🛛 shrub border 🗆 wind break
Irrigation: ⊠ none □ adequate □ inadequate □ excessive □ trunk wetted
Recent site disturbance? NO 🛛 construction 🖓 soil disturbance 🖓 grade change 🖓 herbicide treatment
% dripline paved: 0% Pavement lifted: NO
% dripline w/ fill soil: 0%
% dripline grade lowered: 0%
Soil problems:  drainage  shallow  compacted  droughty  saline  alkaline  acidic  small volume  disease center  history of fail  clay  clay  spect:
Conflicts: 🗆 lights 🗆 signage 🗆 line-of-sight 🗆 view 🗆 overhead lines 🗆 underground utilities 🗆 traffic 🗆 adjacent veg. 🗆
Exposure to wind: 🗆 single tree 🗆 below canopy 🗆 above canopy 🗆 recently exposed 🛛 windward, canopy edge 🗆 area prone to windthrow
<b>Prevailing wind direction:</b> SW Occurrence of snow/ice storms $\Box$ never $\boxtimes$ seldom $\Box$ regularly

# TARGET\_\_\_\_\_

 Use Under Tree: □ building □ parking □ traffic □ pedestrian □ recreation □ landscape □ hardscape □ small features □ utility lines

 Can target be moved? NO
 Can use be restricted? NO

 Occupancy: □ occasional use □ intermittent use □ frequent use □ constant use
 H-17-22 EXHIBITE

ROOT DEFECTS:
Suspect root rot: NO Mushroom/conk/bracket present: NO ID:
Exposed roots:  Severe  moderate  low Undermined:  severe  moderate  low
Root pruned:       distance from trunk       Root area affected:       Buttress wounded: □       When:
Restricted root area:  Severe  Moderate  Moderate  Now  Potential for root failure:  Severe  Moderate  Now  Now  Now  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not
LEAN: 2 deg. from vertical 🛛 natural 🖓 unnatural 🖓 self-corrected 🖓 Soil heaving:
Decay in plane of lean:  Roots broken:  Soil cracking:
Compounding factors: Lean severity:   Severe  moderate  low

*Concern Areas:* Indicate presence of individual structural issues and rate their severity (**S** = severe, **M** = moderate, **L** = low)

DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms/bracket				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
RISK RATING				

Tree part most likely to fail in the next six months: Branches

Failure potential: 1 - low: 2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe	Size of part: <b>0</b> - 0" - 3" <b>1</b> - 3"-6"	<b>2</b> -6"-18"	<b>3</b> -18"-30"	<b>4</b> ->30"
Target rating: 0 - no target 1 - occasional use 2 - intermittent use 3 - frequent use 4	- constant use			

# **Maintenance Recommendations**

Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating	$\boxtimes$ none $\square$ remove defective part $\square$ reduce end weight $\square$ crown clean				
1 1 2 4	$\Box$ thin $\Box$ raise canopy $\Box$ crown reduce $\Box$ restructure $\Box$ cable/brace				
	Inspect further $\Box$ root crown $\Box$ decay $\Box$ aerial $\Box$ monitor				
$\square$ Remove tree $\boxtimes$ When replaced, a similar sized tree species would be appropriate in same general location					
$oxedsymbol{\boxtimes}$ When replaced, alternate tree replacement locations are available					
Effect on adjacent trees: 🗆 none 🛛 evaluate					
Notification: $\boxtimes$ owner $\square$ manager $\boxtimes$ governing agency	Date: 05/12/22				
COMMENTS					

The debris from this removed tree showed no signs or symptoms of above normal tree risk.

Tree #3 - Shortleaf Pine







Map/Location: Right Rear Yard

Owner: public: \_\_\_\_\_ private: \_\_\_\_X unknown: \_\_\_\_\_ other: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 05/12/22\_\_\_\_ Inspector: Bill Leake

Date of last inspection:

# TREE CHARACTERISTICS \_\_\_\_\_

RISK RATING:
<b>1 0 2 3</b> Failure + Size + Target = Risk Potential of part Rating Rating
If approved for removal, the replacement tree species and location shall be listed on the certificate of appropriateness.

Tree #: 4 Spec	cies: Sho	ortlea	f Pine (Pinus e	enchinata)
DBH: 12" # of	f trunks:	1	Height: 50'	Spread: 15'
Form:   genera	lly symm	etric	🛛 minor asymr	metry 🗆 major asymmetry 🗆 stump sprout 🗆 stag-headed
Crown class:	dominant	: 🗆 c	co-dominant	$\Box$ intermediate $\Box$ suppressed
Live crown ratio	<b>o</b> : 95 %	ļ	Age class: 🗆 y	young 🖂 semi-mature 🗆 mature 🗆 over-mature/senescent
Pruning history:	□ crown □cabled/t	clean praced	ed □ excessivel l □ none □ mul	$ Iy thinned \square topped \boxtimes crown raised \square pollarded \square crown reduced \square flush cuts $ $ Itiple pruning events Approx. dates: $
Special Value:	specimer	ו ⊠ h	eritage/historic	$\Box$ wildlife $\Box$ unusual $\Box$ street tree $\Box$ screen $\Box$ shade $\Box$ indigenous $\boxtimes$ protected by gov. ag

# TREE HEALTH \_\_\_\_\_\_

Foliage color. 🛛 normal	chlorotic necrotic Epicormics;	Growth obstructions:
Foliage density:	⊠normal □sparse <b>Leaf size</b> : □ normal □ small	□ stakes □ wire/ties □ signs □ cables
Annual shoot growth:	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ poor $\Box$ none $~$ Twig Dieback: $\Box$	$\Box$ curb/pavement $\Box$ guards
Woundwood :	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ fair $\Box$ poor	
Vigor class:	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ fair $\Box$ poor	
Major pests/diseases:	None	

# SITE CONDITIONS \_\_\_\_\_

Site Character: 🛛 residence 🗆 commercial 🗆 industrial 🗆 park 🗆 open space 🗆 natural 🗆 woodland/forest
Landscape type: 🗆 parkway 🗆 raised bed 🗆 container 🗆 mound 🛛 lawn 🗆 shrub border 🗆 wind break
Irrigation: ⊠ none □ adequate □ inadequate □ excessive □ trunk wetted
Recent site disturbance? NO 🛛 construction 🖓 soil disturbance 🖓 grade change 🖓 herbicide treatment
% dripline paved: 0% Pavement lifted: NO
% dripline w/ fill soil: 0%
% dripline grade lowered: 0%
Soil problems:  drainage  shallow  compacted  droughty  saline  alkaline  acidic  small volume  disease center  history of fail  Clay  expansive  slope  compacted  sources  s
Conflicts: 🗆 lights 🗆 signage 🗆 line-of-sight 🗆 view 🗆 overhead lines 🗆 underground utilities 🗆 traffic 🗆 adjacent veg. 🗆
Exposure to wind: 🗆 single tree below canopy 🗆 above canopy 🗆 recently exposed 🛛 windward, canopy edge 🗆 area prone to windthrow
<b>Prevailing wind direction:</b> <u>SW</u> Occurrence of snow/ice storms $\Box$ never $\boxtimes$ seldom $\Box$ regularly

# TARGET\_\_\_\_\_

 Use Under Tree:
 building
 parking
 traffic
 pedestrian
 recreation
 landscape
 hardscape
 small features
 utility lines

 Can target be moved? NO
 Can use be restricted? NO

 Occupancy:
 occasional use
 intermittent use
 frequent use
 constant use
 H-17-22 EXHIBIT F

ROOT DEFECTS:
Suspect root rot: NO Mushroom/conk/bracket present: NO ID:
Exposed roots:  Severe  moderate  low Undermined:  severe  moderate  low
Root pruned:       distance from trunk       Root area affected:       Buttress wounded: □       When:
Restricted root area:  Severe  Moderate  Moderate  Now  Potential for root failure:  Severe  Moderate  Now  Now  Now  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not
LEAN: 2 deg. from vertical 🛛 natural 🖓 unnatural 🖓 self-corrected 🖓 Soil heaving:
Decay in plane of lean:  Roots broken:  Soil cracking:
Compounding factors: Lean severity:   Severe  moderate  low

*Concern Areas:* Indicate presence of individual structural issues and rate their severity (**S** = severe, **M** = moderate, **L** = low)

DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms/bracket				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
RISK RATING				

Tree part most likely to fail in the next six months: Branches

Failure potential: 1 - low: 2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe	Size of part: <b>0</b> - 0" - 3" <b>1</b> - 3"-6"	<b>2</b> -6"-18"	<b>3</b> -18"-30"	<b>4</b> ->30"
Target rating: 0 - no target 1 - occasional use 2 - intermittent use 3 - frequent use 4	- constant use			

# **Maintenance Recommendations**

Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating $1$ $0$ $2$ $3$	<ul> <li>☑ none □ remove defective part □ reduce end weight □ crown clean</li> <li>□ thin □ raise canopy □ crown reduce □ restructure □ cable/brace</li> </ul>			
	Inspect further 🗆 root crown 🗆 decay 🗆 aerial 🗆 monitor			
$\Box$ Remove tree $\boxtimes$ When replaced, a similar sized tree species would be appropriate in same general location				
$oxedsymbol{\boxtimes}$ When replaced, alternate tree replacement locations are available				
Effect on adjacent trees: $\Box$ none $\boxtimes$ evaluate				
Notification: $\boxtimes$ owner $\square$ manager $\boxtimes$ governing agency	Date: 05/12/22			
COMMENTS				

The debris from this removed tree showed no signs or symptoms of above normal tree risk.

Tree #4 - Shortleaf Pine







Map/Location: Right Rear Yard

Owner: public: \_\_\_\_\_ private: \_\_\_\_X unknown: \_\_\_\_\_ other: \_\_\_\_

Date: 05/12/22\_\_\_\_ Inspector: Bill Leake

Date of last inspection:

# TREE CHARACTERISTICS \_

Tree #: 5 Species: Pecan (Cara illinoensis)

DBH: 12" # of trunks: 1 Height: 50' Spread: 35'

**Form**:  $\square$  generally symmetric  $\square$  minor asymmetry  $\square$  major asymmetry  $\square$  stump sprout  $\square$  stag-headed

**Crown class**: □ dominant ⊠ co-dominant □ intermediate □ suppressed

Live crown ratio: 95 % Age class: 
young 
semi-mature 
mature 
over-mature/senescent

 Pruning history:
 □ crown cleaned
 □ excessively thinned
 □ topped
 ⊠ crown raised
 □ pollarded
 □ crown reduced
 □ flush cuts

 □ cabled/braced
 □ none
 □ multiple pruning events
 Approx. dates:

Special Value: 🗆 specimen 🛛 heritage/historic 🗆 wildlife 🗆 unusual 🗆 street tree 🗆 screen 🗆 shade 🗆 indigenous 🖾 protected by gov. agency

# TREE HEALTH \_\_\_\_\_

Foliage color. 🛛 normal	□ chlorotic □ necrotic Epicormics; □	Growth obstructions:
Foliage density:	⊠normal □sparse Leaf size: □ normal □ small	$\Box$ stakes $\Box$ wire/ties $\Box$ signs $\Box$ cables
Annual shoot growth:	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ poor $\Box$ none $~$ Twig Dieback: $\Box$	curb/pavement
Woundwood :	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ fair $\Box$ poor	
Vigor class:	$\Box$ excellent $\boxtimes$ average $\Box$ fair $\Box$ poor	
Major pests/diseases:	None	

# SITE CONDITIONS \_\_\_\_

Site Character:
residence
commercial
industrial
park
open space
natural
woodland/forest

Landscape type:
parkway
raised bed
container
mound
lawn
shrub border
wind break

Irrigation:
None
adequate
inadequate
excessive
trunk wetted
Recent site disturbance? NO
construction
soil disturbance
grade change
herbicide treatment
% dripline paved:
0% Pavement lifted:
NO
% dripline grade lowered:
0%
Soil problems:
drainage
shallow
compacted
droughty
saline
alkaline
acidic
small
solution
volume
disease center
history of fail
Conflicts:
lights
signage
line-of-sight
view
occurrence of snow/ice storms
never
seldom
regularly

# TARGET\_

 Use Under Tree:
 building
 parking
 traffic
 pedestrian
 recreation
 landscape
 hardscape
 small features
 utility lines

 Can target be moved? NO
 Can use be restricted? YES

 Occupancy:
 occasional use
 intermittent use
 frequent use
 constant use
 H-17-22 EXHIBIT G

### **RISK RATING:**

1	0	1	2	
Failure	+ Size +	Target	= Risk	
Potential	or part	Rating	Rating	
lf approv	ed for remo	oval, the i	replacement tr	ee

If approved for removal, the replacement tree species and location shall be listed on the certificate of appropriateness.

ROOT DEFECTS:
Suspect root rot: NO Mushroom/conk/bracket present: NO ID:
Exposed roots:  Severe  moderate  low Undermined:  severe  moderate  low
Root pruned:       distance from trunk       Root area affected:       Buttress wounded: □       When:
Restricted root area:  Severe  Moderate  Moderate  Now  Potential for root failure:  Severe  Moderate  Now  Now  Now  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not  Not
LEAN: 2 deg. from vertical 🛛 natural 🖓 unnatural 🖓 self-corrected 🖓 Soil heaving:
Decay in plane of lean:  Roots broken:  Soil cracking:
Compounding factors: Lean severity:   Severe  moderate  low

*Concern Areas:* Indicate presence of individual structural issues and rate their severity (**S** = severe, **M** = moderate, **L** = low)

DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms/bracket				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
RISK RATING				

Tree part most likely to fail in the next six months: Branches

Failure potential: 1 - low: 2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe	Size of part: <b>0</b> - 0" - 3" <b>1</b> - 3"-6"	<b>2</b> -6"-18"	<b>3</b> -18"-30"	<b>4</b> ->30"
Target rating: 0 - no target 1 - occasional use 2 - intermittent use 3 - frequent use 4	- constant use			

# **Maintenance Recommendations**

Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating $1 \qquad 0 \qquad 1 \qquad 2$	$\boxtimes$ none $\square$ remove defective part $\square$ reduce end weight $\square$ crown clean $\square$ thin $\square$ raise capacity $\square$ crown reduce $\square$ restructure $\square$ cable/brace		
	Inspect further $\Box$ root crown $\Box$ decay $\Box$ aerial $\Box$ monitor		
□ Remove tree ⊠ When replaced, a similar sized tree species would be appropriate in same general location			
$oxedsymbol{\boxtimes}$ When replaced, alternate tree replacement locations are available			
Effect on adjacent trees: $ extsf{M}$ none $ extsf{D}$ evaluate			
Notification: ⊠ owner □ manager ⊠ governing agency Date: 05/12/22			
COMMENTS			

The debris from this removed tree showed no signs or symptoms of above normal tree risk.

Tree #5 - Pecan







RISK RATING:

1

certificate of appropriateness.

Potential of part Rating

Failure + Size + Target = Risk

1

4

Rating

2

If approved for removal, the replacement tree

species and location shall be listed on the

Site/Address: 401 Union ST S

Map/Location: Left rear of yard at rear corner of detached garage

Owner: public: \_\_\_\_\_ private: \_\_\_\_X unknown: \_\_\_\_\_ other: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 05/12/22\_\_\_\_ Inspector: Bill Leake

Date of last inspection:

### TREE CHARACTERISTICS \_

Tree #: 6 Species: Pecan (Cara illinoensis)

DBH: 19" # of trunks: 1 Height: 50' Spread: 35'

**Form**:  $\boxtimes$  generally symmetric  $\square$  minor asymmetry  $\square$  major asymmetry  $\square$  stump sprout  $\square$  stag-headed

**Crown class**:  $\Box$  dominant  $\boxtimes$  co-dominant  $\Box$  intermediate  $\Box$  suppressed

Live crown ratio: 95 % Age class: 
young 
semi-mature 
mature 
over-mature/senescent

 Pruning history:
 □ crown cleaned
 □ excessively thinned
 □ topped
 ⊠ crown raised
 □ pollarded
 □ crown reduced
 □ flush cuts

 □ cabled/braced
 □ none
 □ multiple pruning events
 Approx. dates:

Special Value: 🗆 specimen 🛛 heritage/historic 🗆 wildlife 🗆 unusual 🗆 street tree 🗆 screen 🗆 shade 🗆 indigenous 🖾 protected by gov. agency

# TREE HEALTH \_\_\_\_\_

Foliage color. 🛛 normal	$\Box$ chlorotic	🗆 necrotic 🛛	Epicormics; 🗆		Growth obstructions:
Foliage density:	⊠normal	□sparse	Leaf size: 🗆 r	normal 🗆 small	$\Box$ stakes $\Box$ wire/ties $\Box$ signs $\Box$ cables
Annual shoot growth:	$\Box$ excellent	🛛 average [	🗆 poor 🗆 none	Twig Dieback:	curb/pavement guards
Woundwood :	□ excellent	average□	🗆 fair 🗆 poor		
Vigor class:	□ excellent	⊠average □	🗆 fair 🗆 poor		
Major pests/diseases:	None				

### SITE CONDITIONS \_\_\_\_

# TARGET\_

 Use Under Tree: □ building □ parking □ traffic □ pedestrian □ recreation □ landscape □ hardscape □ small features □ utility lines

 Can target be moved? NO
 Can use be restricted? NO

 Occupancy: □ occasional use □ intermittent use □ frequent use □ constant use
 H-17-22 EXHIBIT H

ROOT DEFECTS:
Suspect root rot: NO Mushroom/conk/bracket present: NO ID:
Exposed roots:  Severe  moderate  low Undermined:  severe  moderate  low
Root pruned:       distance from trunk       Root area affected:       Buttress wounded: □       When:
Restricted root area: $\Box$ severe $\Box$ moderate $\boxtimes$ low Potential for root failure: $\Box$ severe $\Box$ moderate $\boxtimes$ low
LEAN: 2 deg. from vertical 🛛 natural 🖓 unnatural 🖓 self-corrected 🖓 Soil heaving:
Decay in plane of lean:  Roots broken:  Soil cracking:
Compounding factors: Lean severity:   Severe  moderate  low

*Concern Areas:* Indicate presence of individual structural issues and rate their severity (**S** = severe, **M** = moderate, **L** = low)

DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks		М		
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms/bracket				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
RISK RATING				

Tree part most likely to fail in the next six months: Branches

Failure potential: 1 - low: 2 - medium;	<b>3</b> - high; <b>4</b> - severe	<u>Size of part:</u> <b>0</b> - 0" - 3" <b>1</b> - 3"-6"	<b>2</b> -6"-18"	<b>3</b> -18″-30"	<b>4</b> ->30"
Target rating: 0 - no target 1 - occasional use 2 -	intermittent use <b>3</b> - frequent use <b>4</b> - o	onstant use			

# **Maintenance Recommendations**

Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating	$oxtimes$ none $\Box$ remove defective part $\Box$ reduce end weight $\Box$ crown clear		
<u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>4</u>	$\Box$ thin $\Box$ raise canopy $\Box$ crown reduce $\Box$ restructure $\Box$ cable/brace		
	Inspect further $\Box$ root crown $\Box$ decay $\Box$ aerial $\Box$ monitor		
□ <b>Remove tree</b> □ When replaced, a similar sized tree spec	ies would be appropriate in same general location		
oxdot When replaced, alternate tree replacement	ent locations are available		
Effect on adjacent trees: $\boxtimes$ none $\square$ evaluate			
Notification: $\boxtimes$ owner $\square$ manager $\boxtimes$ governing agency	Date: 05/12/22		
COMMENTS			

The debris from this removed tree showed no signs or symptoms of above normal tree risk.

Tree #6 - Pecan







Map/Location: Rear of house at right of entrance

Owner: public: \_\_\_\_\_ private: \_\_\_\_X unknown: \_\_\_\_\_ other: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 05/12/22\_\_\_\_ Inspector: Bill Leake

Date of last inspection:

### TREE CHARACTERISTICS \_

Tree #: 7 Species: Dogwood (Cornus florida)

DBH: 19" # of trunks: 1 Height: 15' Spread: 10'

**Form**:  $\boxtimes$  generally symmetric  $\boxtimes$  minor asymmetry  $\square$  major asymmetry  $\square$  stump sprout  $\square$  stag-headed

**Crown class**:  $\Box$  dominant  $\boxtimes$  co-dominant  $\Box$  intermediate  $\Box$  suppressed

Live crown ratio: 50 % Age class:  $\Box$  young  $\Box$  semi-mature  $\boxtimes$  mature  $\Box$  over-mature/senescent

 Pruning history:
 □ crown cleaned
 □ excessively thinned
 □ topped
 ⊠ crown raised
 □ pollarded
 □ crown reduced
 □ flush cuts

 □ cabled/braced
 □ none
 □ multiple pruning events
 Approx. dates:

Special Value: 🗆 specimen 🛛 heritage/historic 🗆 wildlife 🗆 unusual 🗆 street tree 🗆 screen 🗆 shade 🗆 indigenous 🖾 protected by gov. agency

# TREE HEALTH \_\_\_\_\_

Foliage color. <ul> <li>normal</li> <li>chlorotic</li> <li>necrotic</li> <li>Epicormics;</li> <li>Growth obstructions:</li> </ul>						
Foliage density:	□normal	⊠sparse	Leaf size: 🗆 🛛	normal 🗆 small	$\Box$ stakes $\Box$ wire/ties $\Box$ signs $\Box$ cables	
Annual shoot growth:	□ excellent	t 🗆 average	$\boxtimes$ poor $\square$ none	Twig Dieback: 🛛	$oxtimes$ curb/pavement $\Box$ guards	
Woundwood :	□ excellent	t 🗆 average 🛙	🛛 fair 🗆 poor			
Vigor class:	□ excellent	t □average I	⊠ fair □ poor			

Major pests/diseases: Die-back of branches

# SITE CONDITIONS \_\_\_\_

 Site Character:
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □
 □

# TARGET\_

 Use Under Tree:
 building ≥ parking □ traffic □ pedestrian □ recreation □ landscape □ hardscape □ small features □ utility lines

 Can target be moved? NO
 Can use be restricted? NO

 Occupancy:
 □ occasional use ≥ intermittent use □ frequent use □ constant use

### **RISK RATING:**

1	0	2	3	
Failure	+ Size +	Target	= Risk	
Potential	of part	Rating	Rating	
If approv	ed for remo	oval, the	replacement ti	ree

If approved for removal, the replacement tree species and location shall be listed on the certificate of appropriateness.

ROOT DEFECTS:
Suspect root rot: NO Mushroom/conk/bracket present: NO ID:
Exposed roots:  Severe  moderate  low Undermined:  severe  moderate  low
Root pruned: distance from trunk Root area affected: Buttress wounded: 🗆 When:
Restricted root area: $\Box$ severe $\Box$ moderate $\boxtimes$ low Potential for root failure: $\Box$ severe $\Box$ moderate $\boxtimes$ low
LEAN: 2 deg. from vertical 🛛 natural 🖓 unnatural 🖓 self-corrected 🖓 Soil heaving:
Decay in plane of lean:  Roots broken:  Soil cracking:
Compounding factors: Lean severity:   Severe  moderate  low

*Concern Areas:* Indicate presence of individual structural issues and rate their severity (**S** = severe, **M** = moderate, **L** = low)

DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark				
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms/bracket				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				L
Borers/termites/ants				
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
RISK RATING				

Tree part most likely to fail in the next six months: Branches

Failure potential: 1 - low: 2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe	Size of part: <b>0</b> -0"-3" <b>1</b> -3"-6"	<b>2</b> -6"-18"	<b>3</b> -18"-30"	<b>4</b> ->30"
Target rating: 0 - no target 1 - occasional use 2 - intermittent use 3 - frequent use 4	- constant use			

### **Maintenance Recommendations**

Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating $1$ $0$ $2$ $3$	<ul> <li>☑ none □ remove defective part □ reduce end weight □ crown clean</li> <li>□ thin □ raise canopy □ crown reduce □ restructure □ cable/brace</li> </ul>				
	Inspect further  root crown  decay  aerial  monitor				
□ <b>Remove tree</b> □ When replaced, a similar sized tree species would be appropriate in same general location					
$oxedsymbol{\boxtimes}$ When replaced, alternate tree replacement	ent locations are available				
Effect on adjacent trees: $\boxtimes$ none $\square$ evaluate					
Notification: $\boxtimes$ owner $\square$ manager $\boxtimes$ governing agency	Date: 05/12/22				
COMMENTS					

The debris from this removed tree did contain some dead branches but the trunk still retained sap.

Tree #7 - Dogwood

















# **Trey Wilson & Sandra West**

401 Union St S Concord, NC 28025

# **Outdoor Living Project:**

• Install a Techo Bloc Shale Grey Blu 60 HD Smooth Slab set in a 3-piece pattern of approximately 792 sq. ft. with an ABC base tamped approx. 4" deep, screenings, Snapedge, nails, and gray Polymeric sand in the joints

	A State Stat		



















# Amarr<sup>®</sup> Lincoln Value Traditional Steel Garage Doors



**Traditional style. Exceptional value.** The Amarr Lincoln collection combines unique, yet timeless traditional designs and color options with the durability & strength of steel and conventional hardware. Along with 21 decorative window choices, this affordable collection delivers premium style at a competitive price. The Amarr Lincoln collection. A new tradition of style and value.





#### PANEL DESIGNS





FP • FLUSH PANEL



\*Available in Amarr Lincoln LI3138 and LI3000 only.

# Amarr<sup>®</sup>Lincoln





165 Carriage Court Winston-Salem, NC 27105 800.503.DOOR www.amarr.com

Door specifications and technical data subject to change without notice.

Sectional door products from Entrematic may be the subject of one or more U.S. and/or foreign, issued and/or pending, design and/or utility patents. Entrematic and Amarr as words and logos are trademarks owned by Entrematic Group AB or companies within the Entrematic Group. ©Entrematic Group AB 2020. All rights reserved. Printed in USA Form #6770721/PDF

